Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/700,473	SUEOKA ET AL.
	Examiner .	Art Unit
	N. Bhat	1764
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>N. Bhat</u> .	(3)	•
(2) <u>Mr. Slobasky</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 18 December 2006	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Appl Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	licant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: None		·
Claims discussed: 1, 16-18 and 5-10, 19-29		·
Prior art documents discussed: None .		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN See Continuation Sheet	IERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separat directly resulted in the allowance of the application. of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separat did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summ 	The examiner will provide a e record of the substance o	written summary of the substance f the interview, since the interview
·		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applica	ant/Applicant's Representati	ve Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner discussed with applicant that during allowance conference the SPE felt method is no more than heat treating and that the apparatus was allowable. In order to advance prosecution the examiner suggested restriction of the method and apparatus, election of the apparatus, allowance of the apparatus and applicant would be free to prosecute the method as a divisional application if so desired. Applicant's representative elected with traverse. On December 20th the examiner sought approval for cancellation of non-elected claims and indicated allowance of the apparatus claims. Applicant authorized cancellation of the claims by examiner's amendment..